(3)

(1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

(CHHATTISGARH) SINGLE BENCH

WRIT PETITION NO. OF 2006

PETITIONER : Smt. Shailja Shukla Wife of Shri Punit Shukla, aged about 32 years, Working on the post of Shiksha Karmi Grade-III, Government Primary School, Patpariya, Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.).
Resident of behind Hotel Shailgiri, Manendragarh Road, Patpariya, Post Raghavpur, District Surguja (C.G.).

3039/06 &
3038/06
P.R. No. Monday
Presented by Shri V.K.
dated 23/6/06

RECEIVED-COPY
CLERK to A.G. BILASPUR
23/6/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Department of Environment and Urban Development, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).

2. The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.).

3. The Collector, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.).

4. The District Education Officer, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.).

5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.).

(4)

(2)

6. The chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION ETC.

XI-HC-78

(23)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.2227/06 **सन्** **200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	27.6.2006:- Shri V.K. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Ashutosh Kachhawaha, Govt. Advocate for the State/ respondents No.1, 3 and 4 on advance copy. Heard both the counsel. The main grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition is that presently she is working as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III under the respondent No.2. However, respondent No.2 is not paying salary to the petitioner since April, 2005. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that vide Annexure-P/5 the amount has already been sent by the Chief Executive Officer, Surguja to the respondent No.2, even then the payment has not been made to the petitioner. He further submitted that in the circumstances, respondent No.2 be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner regarding payment of salary to which learned counsel for respondents No.1, 3 and 4 has no objection. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a representation to the respondent No.2 within a period of 10 days and in turn, respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of one month from the date of receipt of representation, in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	
Barve		

30.6.06